Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VI, NO. 46, *Issue Number* 303, NOVEMBER 16, 1949 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED NOV 21 1949 LIBRARY

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GERMAN SCENE

by Felix Morley

When Secretary of State Acheson hurriedly decided to visit Bonn, as an invited guest of the West German Republic, he pointed up the ironic struggle for German affections now being waged between the conquerors of that country.

The Russians are furnishing further evidence of this extraordinary competition. Their current counterstroke is to have the East German Government restore full citizenship, including the right of holding public office, to all Nazis in the Soviet zone who are not already in jail for "war crimes or other Fascist acts". The intimation that only Fascists commit war crimes is the more suggestive because of the current Russian effort to stigmatize the United States as a Fascist nation.

Along with the vindication of former Nazis, the East German Government is now making a decided play for the support of all Germans who believe in free enterprise. Deputy Prime Minister Hermann Kastner asserted in Berlin last week that it is impossible "to transfer the economic structure of the Soviet Union to Germany". His remarks are the more important because Herr Kastner is the East German leader of the same political party (Free Democrats) that is headed in West Germany by President Theodor Heuss, at Bonn.

Herr Kastner also said in print -- of course with Russian permission -- that when Germany is reunited it "cannot and will not be a Communist unity". Simultaneously the East German National Democratic Party, largely composed of former Nazis and therefore without a counterpart in West Germany, came out with a resolution for governmental support of private retail business in the Soviet zone as "an important precondition for strengthening and broadening the National Front".

It is no longer possible to ignore these indications of a wholly new Russian policy towards Germany, based on a belief that the Reich can be reunited and rebuilt as a quasi-independent ally rather than as a Communist dependency of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately our correspondents in Germany seem for the most part to have remained blissfully unaware of what was happening under their noses. The failure to report on the headway which Russia -- as contrasted with Communism -- is making there is understandable. Many American reporters in Germany speak no German.

Copyright 1949 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II

It does not take a long stay in Germany, assuming some disposition and ability to ascertain the German viewpoint, to realize that the Western Powers, especially the United States, have fumbled at least as often as have the Russians. A good football coach analyzes the mistakes of his own team. And it is well to realize now that something much more serious than a football game can be lost in Germany, as it has already been lost in China.

In Germany we have fumbled, in the sense of playing directly into eager Russian hands, at least the following major issues: (1) dismantling; (2) deportations; (3) re-education; (4) war criminals. While these are cited in what seems to me their order of importance, as cardinal blunders, it is important to emphasize that the mistakes made interact and aggravate each other. The issues were part of an integrated policy of vengeance. They supported each other when a policy of vengeance towards Germany could be said to make some sense. They still support each other.

With the successful Russian manufacture of the atomic bomb it should have become apparent that the Kremlin has made effective use of German technical skill. That is as obvious, in retrospect, as the evidence that at Yalta the Russian leaders successfully prepared their eventual victory in China. And there is certainly nothing pleasant, from our viewpoint, in the tendency toward an amalgamation of Chinese manpower and German technology, under Communist leadership.

In short, when Stalin revealed his hand, American intelligence should immediately have revised our policy to follow suit. We are just beginning to do so.

Approximately one thousand industrial plants in the Western zones, making everything from steel to soap, have now been completely dismantled, and this fatuous policy still goes on.

The immediate economic effects of dismantling have been less than might be expected, partly because the United States in the last analysis pays all the financial cost involved; partly because most of those actually thrown out of work can be reabsorbed in the repair and rebuilding of houses and bridges. But the psychological effects of dismantling have been disastrous. As Minister-President Karl Arnold of North Rhine-Westphalia, said to me: "You are dismantling men as well as machines."

III

The full force of this remark did not come home until I talked with some tragic representatives of the eight million or so expelled persons who have been crowded into Western Germany. Perhaps our collective con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

science need not be disturbed by the indescribable misery in which these wholly dispossessed people are living. But we should at least be aware of the bitterness and hatred with which they regard those responsible for dismantling.

To the unemployed and completely dispossessed workman from East Prussia or the Sudetenland, dismantling is taken as proof that American vindictiveness still rules, dooming him to be the goat in a highly unsavory goat pasture. And these people, who with any sort of a fair deal would have been ardently pro-American, are now saying openly that if they have any future, it seems to lie in working with and for Russia.

I was told that before my visit there, no other American had ever been inside a foul air raid bunker in Hanover, where nearly a thousand men, women and children are living in conditions to which most of us would not condemn that many dogs. But if we do not know of the ghost-like tubercular children who haunt these cellars, the Germans do. And their knowledge makes our "re-educational" preaching, about the opportunity of America, and the virtues of Americans, exceedingly sardonic. Here again we are compared unfavorably with the Russians. "At least they are not hypocrites."

And on that note the average German, if you show any interest in his thinking, is likely to turn to the "war criminals". "After all", say those who are living like rats amid the ruins, "our generals fought to save us from this." "After all", say the lawyers who have watched these trials, "the Russian method of shooting and getting it over quickly is a preferable application of victor's justice." "After all", in the words of a leader in the Resistance Movement, "the Russians don't camouflage their spiritual desolation with the fake morality which you Americans like to assume."

The upshot of it all, whether or not reported, is that to many Germans, and by contrast with our prattle about democracy and freedom, a working relationship with Russia begins to look quite reasonable. If that is reprehensible on the part of the Germans, at least it is not unnatural. If forced to the choice, many of us might conclude that honest pagans are more congenial than fraudulent Christians.

IV

How Germany will go now seems to me to hang in the balance, but two conclusions from the obvious failure of our policy there seem to me inescapable and important.

The more obvious of these is the responsibility of the much-advertised "bipartisan" attitude for what has happened. Politics should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stop at the water's edge only when policies stop at the water's edge. If isolationism is abandoned, a critical attitude in foreign policy must immediately be adopted. The Opposition in Parliament never pulled any punches, in the days when Brittania ruled the waves. Edmund Burke and Charles James Fox are remembered; not so those Whigs who said: "me too".

In practice, a bipartisan foreign policy simply means that it is nobody's business to point out blunders while they are being made. Worse than that, the bipartisan attitude explains why it is considered "bad form" even to mention these blunders until too late. Under our system of government, never designed for imperial duties, it was natural that third-rate political sychophants should be assigned world-wide pro-consular responsibilities. Under a bipartisan foreign policy it was inevitable that their stupidities, when nothing worse, should go un-detected by the long-suffering taxpayers at home. But the burden of proof for continued "bipartisanship" now rests on those who defend it.

In all the abundant evidence of Republican incompetence, the Dewey-Vandenberg-Dulles support of bipartisan foreign policy is probably the most glaring, as historically it will prove the most costly and dis-astrous. And, behind this inanity, now becoming fairly clear, there lurks an even more disturbing specter.

This is the evidence, from which the Russians have drawn appropri-ate conclusions, that bureaucratic government will only work when it pays no attention whatever to public opinion -- to what we loosely call "democracy". The Kremlin can make a marriage of convenience with Ger-many today as easily as it did with Hitler in 1939. And all that blocks the consummation of this marriage is the lingering German hope that when we talk of unity in Western Europe we do so with some real conviction, and some intention to promote it.

Our Federal Government today exhibits the many weaknesses of a hypertrophied bureaucracy -- clumsiness, extravagance, irresponsibility and inefficiency. It also has the weakness of democracy, which is that the elected leadership does not dare to reverse a foolish policy until its total bankruptcy stares a majority of the voters in the face.

Soviet Russia is free from that weakness. That is why the Kremlin won in China, and could very possibly win an even more devastating vic-tory in Germany.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events *A Supplement to* Human Events

Vol. VI, No. 46
November 16, 1949

NOV 21 1949 LIBRARY

A REVIEW OF REVIEWING

by J. M. Lalley

The belated attention given to Mr. A. Frank Reel's history of The Case of General Yamashita provides an occasion for a scrutiny of book reviewing practices in the United States. The book was published early in September, and has been generally ignored or slighted in the literary columns and supplements. At the present, to be sure, it is commanding a good deal of interest in the news and editorial pages and even in radio commentaries as the result of stories leaking out of Tokyo that the occupation authorities have not only forbidden the publication of a Japanese edition but have warned the Japanese press that no mention is to be made even of the existence of the book. Thus a controversy of some proportions turns upon the question of whether this censorship can be justified as a measure of expediency. The official view seems to be that Mr. Reel's revelations would be seized upon joyfully by the Japanese Communists as another means of arousing popular hostility to the Occupation and of destroying American face. The view of Mr. Reel's publishers is that it is stupid and hypocritical to preach democratic principles to the Japanese while refusing to permit a concrete application of them. This controversy, however, is somewhat irrelevant to our inquiry; for it does not explain why Mr. Reel had previously been snubbed by American literary editors, who are under no necessity to consult General MacArthur's pleasure.

If it is one of the functions of reviewers to instruct their readers about the relative importance of currently published books, I think we can say that this was an instance in which they failed of their duty. The affair of General Yamashita is certainly of no less historical and juridical consequence than the case of Dreyfus or that of Sacco and Vanzetti. It was the first of the American war crimes trials, and established the patterns of procedure followed in subsequent trials. The proceedings were instigated by General MacArthur on his own authority and in conformity with his proclamation that he would hold the Japanese military leaders personally responsible for every crime or violation of the usages of war that might be committed by Japanese soldiers in the Philippines. This marriage of the principles of collective guilt and of individual responsibility was one for which there was no precedent in international law or military custom. Yamashita's status when he was brought to judgment was that of a prisoner of war, for he had surrendered with his forces in obedience to the command of his Emperor. He was tried on what was then American soil by an American tribunal constituted under a directive that instructed the judges to disregard all customary rules of evidence and proof, and that virtually prescribed in advance a verdict of guilty.

The principal basis of the charges against Yamashita was the series of atrocities, including murder, rape, mutilation and torture, perpetrated by the Japanese in Manila in the last hysterical days of the siege of that capital. Of the atrocities themselves there is no doubt; but under General MacArthur's directive order it was not necessary to prove that Yamashita had ordered or encouraged or condoned them, or even that he had any knowledge of them; all that was needed to establish

Copyright 1949 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his guilt was the fact that he was technically in command when they were committed. In reality the atrocities were not the work of Yamashita's soldiers but of naval troops who had remained in Manila contrary to his orders to evacuate the city, and most of them perished there. At the time, Yamashita's communications were so thoroughly disrupted that he had almost no knowledge of anything that was happening beyond the vicinity of his own headquarters in the mountains of Luzon.

It was, however, Yamashita's fortune to be represented by exceptionally conscientious and courageous military counsel, of whom Mr. Reel was one. They found themselves denied adequate time for the preparation of a defense; severely restricted by the Court in their efforts to cross-examine witnesses. After Yamashita had been convicted and sentenced to death, three of them invited the displeasure of their superiors by flying to Washington to appeal to the Supreme Court for writs of certiorari and habeas corpus. The Court admitted the application, although a peremptory order from the Secretary of War was necessary to prevent Yamashita from being hanged while the hearing was in progress. After what appears to have been a long and bitter dispute among its members, a majority of the Court decided it had no Constitutional warrant for intervention, although the vehemently dissenting Justice Rutledge insisted that the conduct of the trial had been in contravention of the Articles of War, the Geneva Convention, and the Fifth Amendment. "I am completely unable", said the justice, "to accept or to understand the Court's ruling concerning the applicability of the due process clause . . . to this case. Not heretofore has it been held that any human being is beyond its universally protecting spread in the guaranty of a fair trial in the most fundamental sense. The door is dangerous to open. I will have no part in opening it. For once it is ajar, even for enemy belligerents, it can be pushed back wider for others, perhaps ultimately for all." The majority of the Court, however, was careful to refrain from any opinion about the conduct of the tribunal or concerning the character of the evidence employed against Yamashita, which had included such exhibits as an American propaganda film. This was not the case with Justice Murphy who joined Rutledge in angry dissent.

I think I have now said enough to demonstrate that The Case of General Yamashita is from any historical point of view an important book, as important, certainly, as any that has appeared since the beginning of the Fall publishing season. Every history of the post-war epoch and every further history of Constitutional Law must take account of the story it relates. Moreover, the story of Yamashita, who was excommunicated by his victorious adversary from the chivalrous and magnanimous profession of arms, and accordingly stripped of his uniform and hanged in prison clothes, is one to provoke the tragic emotions of pity and fear. Thus Mr. Reel's book has even some claims to consideration as an exercise of literature. On this score it might bear comparison, for example, with Mr. Walter Van Tilburg Clark's novel The Ox-Bow Incident, which at the time of its publication nearly ten years ago moved so many influential reviewers to ecstasies of praise. There is at any rate a striking similarity of theme. The main difference, as far as I can perceive, is that where Mr. Clark was attempting an imaginative reconstruction of a minor lynching episode of the frontier cattle wars of nearly half a century ago, Mr. Reel is reciting historical fact involving contemporary personages of great eminence.

How then may we account for the circumstance that the very publications that were so enthusiastic about The Ox-Bow Incident avoided mention of The Case of General Yamashita, or considered it perfunctorily several weeks after its publication? One obvious answer is that American sensibility to injustice is far less acute in 1949 than in 1940. The conscience becomes numbed by successive shocks; when injustice is pandemic it begins to seem normal and may even acquire in many eyes an appearance of justice. Another answer might be that of mere ignorance; after all it is nearly eight years since Yamashita's name was daily fodder for the headlines as the conqueror of Malaya and Singapore. I discover that even well-informed persons now tend to confuse him with Admiral Yamamoto. But if such confu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sions existed also in the minds of literary editors they could have been dispelled by Mr. Reel's book, so that it seems reasonable to assume that few of them could have bothered to read it.

Nor is Mr. Reel's book an isolated case of neglect. There is also the example of Mr. Montgomery Belgion's brilliant analysis of the proceedings at Nuremberg. I can recall having seen but two reviews of this work; one of them I wrote myself for HUMAN EVENTS, from the English edition; the other, based on Mr. Henry Regnery's amplified American edition, appeared, I think, in the Christian Science Monitor. The slight might have been less conspicuous if Mr. Belgion were an obscure author capable of being dismissed as a crank. He is actually a writer and critic of some international reputation, and presumably well known to the literary circles of New York, seeing that he was for some years associated with Messrs. Harcourt, Brace and Company. Two other books that I think were similarly ignored were Mr. John T. Flynn's study of The Roosevelt Myth and Mr. George Morgenstern's interpretation of the Pearl Harbor mystery. These works, to be sure, were on a somewhat different plane from those of Messrs. Reel and Belgion. They were primarily historical causeries and perhaps under some suspicion of political bias; but this would apply equally to many books of opposite political complexion that were given prominent treatment in the New York literary supplements; and the point of course is not that the Messrs. Flynn and Morgenstern were reviewed with hostility or disparagement. They were not reviewed at all.

Another current example of neglect that appears to be more than oversight or inadvertence is provided by Mr. Paul Blanshard's American Freedom and Catholic Power. This book written, as I suspect, ad hominem, purports to show by quotations and excerpts from the writings of popes, prelates and theologians, and from other ecclesiastical documents, a carefully prepared and organized plan by the hierarchy to gain control of the public educational system and of American institutions generally. But although this book has been largely unreviewed it cannot be said to have lacked publicity. It is actually an elaboration of the series of articles written by Mr. Blanshard for the Nation, which resulted in the exclusion of that journal from the reading lists of the New York schools. The book has had a good deal of friendly attention from Left Wing publications like the New Republic, and from some Protestant journals like the Christian Century. It has of course been angrily condemned in the Catholic Press. But in general the newspaper and magazine book departments have either evaded it entirely or have dealt with it gingerly and equivocally and with every sign of reluctance. Some have even refused to accept paid advertising for the book.

For this attitude, however, there is a certain sanction in precedent. Religious polemic is among the traditional tabus of American journalism; and such a book might afford one of the rare instances in which a publisher would remove the matter from the discretion of his literary editor and make his wishes emphatically understood. There is, among the older generation in journalism at any rate, a general belief that in the field of controversy in which Mr. Blanshard is engaged, nothing is ever clarified by argument, since each side is incapable of accepting the premises of the other. It is therefore concluded that the net result is to awaken and to exacerbate latent jealousies and suspicions. There are evidently some who are persuaded that this result was not wholly alien to Mr. Blanshard's intention in writing the book.

Nevertheless, this is one of the examples cited to support the allegation that there are "concerted boycotts" and "conspiracies of silence" against particular books that are offensive to some powerful interest. So far as it implies a general collusion among editors, the charge is, I believe, without any real foundation. So far as it suggests external intimidation, I think it is much exaggerated. I can remember only one instance where direct intimidation was attempted in the case of an already published book. The occasion was Mr. William L. White's Report on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russians, published during the war. A manifesto with the signatures of several influential writers was circulated among reviewers, and contained vague hints of reprisal against all who might suggest that Mr. White's book was anything but a flagrant betrayal of Russian hospitality, an impediment to the war effort, and a mendacious and gratuitous insult to an heroic ally. In this case the effort at intimidation failed completely; but there was certainly a period in the later 1930s when any writer bold enough to disparage the Soviet Union might expect to find himself a target of critical abuse or alternatively of critical ostracism.

Since the volume of books published in the course of any given season so greatly exceeds the possibilities of review, the chief problem of every literary editor is one of selection, and the difficulty of the problem increases in inverse ratio to the amount of space available. Generally speaking, the editor is given a complete freedom of selection; but it is only in publications of limited and select circulation that he may dare to make it wholly on grounds of artistic merit and pure literary interest. Needless to say the selection is somewhat influenced by both the personal predilections and the practical problems of the editor. A reviewer who undertakes the harrowing job of providing a daily review of a thousand words or thereabouts will necessarily choose the books easiest to read and requiring least cogitation. This is one reason why daily book departments are so largely devoted to works of fiction and biography. A reviewer who is greatly concerned about establishing his reputation among readers and his personal influence in the trade will give a good deal of attention to books for which a wide sale is anticipated and which therefore will be most extensively advertised; and he will develop a manner of prose that can be readily excerpted for quotation. Similarly, a reviewer of devout ideological allegiances is not unlikely to be guided by them in both choices and judgments. It is perhaps only unfortunate coincidence that so many book reviewers have been recruited from the class and generation that have proved most susceptible to radical philosophies, but it helps to explain the predominantly Leftist tinge of American literary publications.

Book reviewing may be classified under two species: the first is that of the professional who undertakes to examine and discuss all categories of books and to exemplify the maxim, humani nil a me alienum puto. But such a reviewer must take care that universality of mind does not lead him too far beyond the probable interests of the mass of his readers, or the probable content of the bookshop shelves. The other species is that which results where books are assigned to persons presumed to be especially familiar with the subject of the book. Here of course all depends upon the judgment of the editor who assigns the books, and where great discretion is shown the results are usually excellent, as in the case of the Literary Supplement of the Times of London. But it is also a method that readily lends itself to the traditional abuse of log-rolling and the indulgence of literary jealousies and grudges, thereby permitting the making and destroying of literary reputations without much regard to the objective merits of the books concerned.

But we must beware of a temptation to suppose that since such opportunities exist, they are generally or even frequently exploited. No single factor suffices to explain the present low estate of American reviewing; but if there is one factor stronger than the rest, it is not politics or policy but the increasing preoccupation of book publishers with quantitative rather than qualitative considerations, which has by contagion also affected reviewers. The vast majority of purchasers of trade books and of subscribers to the larger book clubs are women. Nowadays this is never lost to mind in contracting for manuscripts and in the preparation of trade lists. Nor can it be ignored in the review columns of any publication of wide general circulation. Thus reviewing, like the stage and the movies, and like our literature itself, reflects the increasing feminization of American culture.

1710 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events Vol. VI, No. 46

LIBRARY

By Bertrand de Jouvenel PARIS -- November, 1949

JUSTICE AND THE LAW: Political events of this month dwindle into insignificance, compared with the underlying significance of the Pope's address to Catholic jurists (November 6), warning judges that they "cannot in any circumstances, expressly recognize and approve an unjust law, and therefore cannot deliver a penal sentence which is equivalent to such approval".

This of course is nothing new to any Christian of whatever variety, nor indeed to any believer of whatever faith. But it was well worth saying and emphasizing at a time when the whole idea of Law has been completely perverted. Law is currently believed by many to be nothing more than the command of the existing political authority, the judge's business being merely to deduce the practical consequence of any such general command.

It is indeed very suitable that mocking Communist voices should immediately have been raised demanding how the justice of a law is to be measured, pointing out that the Pope's thesis opens the door to individual appreciation and "strikes at the very foundations of justice". This echoes Pilate: "What is truth?"

It comes as no surprise that the Communists should take the stand common to all authoritarians. This is, that order is best preserved when commands are unquestioningly carried out, there being no dictates of conscience to set off against them, conscience being nothing other than an individual manifestation which must bow to the social command.

Would that this view, so eloquently denounced by Dostoievski, in his portrait of the Grand Inquisitor, were restricted to the Communists alone! It is unfortunately all too common among other groups. Today there is a widely accepted notion that all value judgments are subjective, and that, for the sake of order, all must bow to that judgment which has been passed by the competent body, speaking more or less fictitiously in the name of a majority. This is pure Hobbesianism. It altogether identifies Justice with Expediency. It is always expedient to settle in advance what is permissible and what is not. But the decision must be taken on the grounds of Justice, and if it is not so taken, "neither the verdict of the Senate nor the verdict of the People" as Cicero said, can make it right, or can prevent the individual -- especially if he be clothed with some brief authority -- from following the dictates of Justice over and against those of the law. This truth, so unfortunately clouded by Austinianism and similar evils, has to be restated in our day.

It is most urgently needed in countries which are subjected to or threatened by tyranny. True we are not so enlightened that we can individually unfailingly discern what is right, and we must meekly defer to the decisions of others as long as we can do so without committing sin. That the judge may sin when he condemns the innocent, because it is the law, we have been taught by the story of Jesus Himself. Obviously, Christians cannot adhere to any theory justifying the legal condemnation of Jesus.

* * *

THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE: Somehow the idea that the law can be unjust has suffered in our democratic era. That is due to a confusion between the belief that the people as a whole are more apt than any individual to agree on just laws, and the quite different belief that the will of a majority can be invoked to justify any law, merely by virtue of being a majority.

Copyright 1949 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We know that the will of the majority is invoked to justify the most terrible injustice in totalitarian countries. And the artificial nature of the link between law-making and the will of the people, even in our democracies, was brought home to me by a recent conversation here in Paris.

A group of French politicians were discussing the reform of the electoral law. Under the Third Republic, the House was made up of deputies elected by the constituency system. There were two ballots. On the first those who had obtained an absolute majority were elected. On the second ballot unsuccessful candidates withdrew in favor of other contestants whose views were acceptable to them, and a relative majority gave the decision. Now, in much larger constituencies, proportional representation obtains, so that the seats to be filled are divided among parties according to the number of votes obtained.

The experts assembled that evening were engaged in showing how different the French Chamber of Deputies would be if the previous system had been retained (far less extreme in both directions). And they enumerated important laws which would not have been passed and important bills which would not have failed, if we had kept the old electoral law.

Listening to them I fell to thinking that the slightest difference in the electoral system makes a great difference in "the will of the people" as embodied in the law-making body. Laws now held to be the will of the people would not have been so.

How, then, can we set something so doubtful against the word of God and the voice of conscience?

* * *

EUROPEAN INTEGRATION: There is no occasion which more obviously calls for consultation of the people than any change of political allegiance. The difficult duty of making laws must ever be entrusted to an ad hoc body, though it is not at all clear why important laws should not be subject to the referendum, as in Switzerland. But a point on which the people can and must always be directly consulted is their allegiance to a smaller or larger community.

If the nations of Western Europe are to merge in a United Europe, surely the people will have to give a clear mandate to that effect. And if some small beginning of this United Europe is actually to take shape, it must be in a body elected by Europeans, to the effect of representing the whole as against the national governments representing the parts. The Assembly of the Council of Europe, which met for the first time in Strasbourg this summer, was a quite remarkable collection of men drawn from national parliaments. However, they lacked the authority which they might have claimed had they been sent to this meeting by popular choice and as a result of a popular pronouncement on the issue of European Union.

They did try mildly to assert themselves. But the Council of Ministers in its recent session denied their every demand, including the effort to establish some small body of servants to the Assembly upon the excellent model of the expert bodies which serve the U.S. committees of the United States Congress. This denial should be taken in conjunction with Mr. Hoffman's strongly worded interrogation to the governments of Europe, asking in effect: "Are you, yes or no, going to move forward towards a United Europe?"

The answer is no!

To take the situation under its two aspects: is there any sign that the governments are willing to further, or even to allow the growth of, a European political authority? The answer to that is negative. Are the European governments on the other hand willing to devalue economic frontiers so that, in respect of economic circulation, political disunity does not matter, or matters less? The answer is again no. An English historian was telling me only a few days ago that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Customs stopped the entrance of six copies of his latest book, in a French edition, contending that an exchange control permit should have been obtained, as for all imports, although no payment of foreign currency was involved.

In matters of restraint of trade the British Government is by far the chief offender. Devaluation of the pound has, in this respect, changed nothing. Nor should any great importance be attached to the freeing of certain inter-European imports from quota regulations. This looks far better than it is in fact.

* * *

EYES ON AMERICA: European integration is at this moment so obviously stymied that an alternative idea is gaining much ground. It is emphasized that a certain integration is in fact on its way; not integration of Western Europe as such but integration of the Western European countries in an Atlantic community. This is happening, and while the incentive to combine is not strong in the case of European Union, the incentive to amalgamate with the United States in some form or other is far more powerful.

What is European union in fact? It boils down to American protection and American money. Not one State of Western Europe looks to its associates for military assistance and economic help. Their unity consists in jointly turning their eyes toward the same provider. Their provider in vain urges them to get together. The United States might find quite a different response were it to say: "Come in with me!" Thus speak quite a number of responsible Europeans who feel that the real problem is to devise some form of union with the U.S.

Thus history repeats itself. Athens in its day, and then Rome, had "allies" of this nature more or less organically integrated; and aiming in the case of Rome at a full merger giving them equal rights. The historian must give warning that this process has never taken place without a lot of unpleasantness between the hegemony and the allied cities.

* * *

TWO MONTHS OF DEVALUATION: I have just spent a fortnight in England and have found no sign that devaluation of the pound has at all improved the situation. This is hardly surprising, considering that all the mechanisms through which a lowering of the currency acts upon the national economy have been broken or paralyzed. Devaluation should attract foreign capital, provided it is free to move. It should permit exporters to enlarge their sales on hard markets, provided there are available sources of production on which they can draw. Let us hope that devaluation will have some favorable effect. But none of the industrialists or economists I was privileged to see nourished great expectations.

In the meantime a troublesome situation is arising in the market for public funds. It had been the government's proud boast that they could manage the rate of interest so well that money would continue to be available at very low prices, a recipe patented by Keynes and amply used during the war by the Churchill government. Thanks to the low rate of interest, a huge national debt seemed a relatively light burden.

Unfortunately, the rate of interest in Britain is rising irresistibly. The two and a half per cent "Dalton" bonds have fallen by successive stages as low as 65, which represents a rate of interest of 3.75 and on November 8 the 4 per cent Consols broke below 100. This of course involves very serious consequences.

Firstly, banks, insurance companies and generally all financial institutions are carrying enormous amounts of these government funds and will have to show considerable losses in their current accounts. Secondly, it had been regarded as safe by successive Chancellors, on the assumption that the secret of low rates had been found, to keep a large part of the debt in floating or short-term form. But with the rate of interest rising fast the Treasury may find it costly, and even diffi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cult, to provide for the renewal of bonds falling due. In fact, Treasury difficulties threaten to be the next manifestation of the English crisis.

This rise in the rate of interest may well be the outcome of the very mild disinflation tried since the beginning of the year. There will always be money to borrow if you ladle it out and keep the supply of consumer goods small and closely controlled. If you pour out less money, and simultaneously ease up a little on consumer controls, you will find that the money available for borrowing shrinks.

Thus if you have a large debt, and cannot afford a rise in the rate of interest, you are condemned to go on with your slow process of inflation. Indeed if you have made many burdensome promises in nominal values, inflation must be regarded as a necessity.

* * *

BRITISH POLITICS GROW BITTER: For the first time in my experience, I have found in England real animus in the political battle. The heat with which a section of the Socialists speak of their opponents is something new and disturbing. On the other hand there is no doubt that the middle class has completely reversed its attitude to the Labor Government.

The general attitude of the middle class, say in 1946, was acceptance of the new regime on the following lines: "We did too little and too late in behalf of the manual workers. Now their chosen leaders are tilting the political balance in their favor. Most of what they do is what we should have done, what in fact we had started doing."

Now the tone is quite different. The British middle class accepted immense sacrifices in a patriotic spirit to win the war. After the war these sacrifices continued because the position of the country was difficult and because it was believed that the lot of the working class should nevertheless be improved. Now after almost five years, the middle class begins to find its burden intolerable.

There is not much to show for sacrifices made. The Dalton crisis of 1947 marked the end of hope that the immediate post-war American loan would rehabilitate the country. The pound crisis of 1949 marked the end of hope that the Marshall Plan would do the job. Now the patriotic middle class is becoming deeply critical of the Labor Government. It compares five years of sacrifices, resulting in military victory, with four subsequent years of sacrifices resulting in an impaired position abroad. Moreover, it is evident that even the position of the working class is not secured. Dollars may any day be missing to secure food and raw materials. Indeed the government has now embarked upon a process of slowly devaluing the worker's real wage in order to pay for the services of the State. Mr. Morrison explained only a few days ago that "the more we spend as a community the less is left over to spend individually"; the way this lessening occurs is through rise in prices unattended by wage increases.

In short inevitable inflation cheats the workers of their social expectations at least in part, just as the middle class was cheated of its national expectations.

The bitterness which is arising between the middle class and the government brings out into the open an as yet unperceived problem.

If you want to create a Socialist Society, the Communist way to do it is to extirpate the previously responsible managers and put new men in their stead.

If you don't want to be that extreme, if you want to keep your executives and professional classes, you must treat them well. If they feel that they are not left with the proper means to perform their function they must, eventually, get restless. That is happening now in England. Then the bourgeoisie may be accused of sabotage, and that accusation is being heard from the Left Wing of the Socialist Party.

In short the admirable unity of spirit, which we have come to expect in England, is showing signs of deterioration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED